

# An Analysis on Understanding the Quality of Work Life of Employees at WABCO India Limited, Chennai

G. Manickam<sup>1</sup>, Prathana T H<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup> Associate Professor, MEASI Institute of Management, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India<sup>2</sup> MBA Student, MEASI Institute of Management, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India  
manickamg@measiim.edu.in<sup>1</sup>, prathan203@gmail.com<sup>2</sup>**Received:** 20-03-2024**Accepted:** 14-05-2024**Published:** 16-05-2024

## Abstract

**Background / Objectives:** Quality of Work Life (QWL) is the level of satisfaction, comfort, and overall well-being experienced by employees in their work environment.

**Methods:** It consists of various factors such as job satisfaction, work-life balance, workplace safety, opportunities for growth and development, organizational culture, and interpersonal relationships.

**Statistical Analysis / Findings:** It consists of various factors such as job satisfaction, work-life balance, workplace safety, opportunities for growth and development, organizational culture, and interpersonal relationships.

**Applications / Improvements:** This abstract highlight the importance of creating a supportive and enriching work environment that promotes the physical, mental, and emotional health of employees, thereby fostering a mutually beneficial relationship between individuals and their workplace.

**Keywords:** Satisfaction, Productivity, QWL.

## 1. Introduction

Quality of work life refers to how satisfied and fulfilled employees feel in their jobs. It's influenced by factors like job satisfaction, work-life balance, career opportunities, fair compensation, a supportive work environment, flexibility, and good relationships with colleagues. When these factors are positive, it leads to happier, more productive employees and benefits both individuals and organizations.

### Study Objectives

- To elucidate the factors influencing the Quality of Work Life.
- To identify the relationship between the Employees.
- To explore the fulfilment level of the employees in the organization.
- To analyze better ways to improve the quality of work life in the company

### Significance of the Study

Individuals' Quality of Work Life is measured by their level of satisfaction, motivation, and commitment. QWL is the degree of excellence brought about work and working conditions which contribute to the global satisfaction and performance primarily at the individual level but finally at the organization level. Thus, studying the quality of work life will help in the understanding the needs and perception of the employees by the management and take appropriate steps to address employee's concerns.

- Better performance of employees.
- Voluntary involvement on the part of employees.
- More devotion and dedication towards work.
- Training of employees to improve problem solving skills.
- Reduced observation.

### Research Methodology

Sample unit: The sample unit of the research is employee from each level in various department in WABCO INDIA LTD, Chennai

Respondents Size: 82.

### Sampling Technique

Non- Probability method of sampling is used to choose the sample respondents. In particular the convenient sampling is followed to have the sample.

### Research Instrument

A questionnaire is prepared especially for this purpose of research in Work Life.

### Statistical Tools and Techniques

#### Descriptive statistics

- Percentage Method
- Weighted Average Method

#### Parametric test

- One way ANOVA Method
- T- test

#### Non parametric test

- One-Sample Kolmogorov - Smirnov Test
- Chi-square test

## 2. Analysing Data

**Table 1. One-Sample Statistics**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Salary	82	3.33	1.031	.114
Chance in decision-making	82	2.78	1.019	.112
Motivational Schemes	82	1.51	.503	.056
Current Job	82	2.15	.739	.082

**Table 2. One-Sample Test**

	Test Value = 0				
	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
					Lower
Salary	29.240	81	.000	3.329	3.10
DM	24.718	81	.000	2.780	2.56
Motivational Schemes	27.228	81	.000	1.512	1.40
Current Job	26.298	81	.000	2.146	1.98

**Table 3. One-Sample Test1**

	Test Value = 0	
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	Upper	
Salary	3.56	
DM	3.00	
Motivational Schemes	1.62	
Current Job	2.31	

### 3. Interpretation

- **Salary:** The t-TEST has t value of 29.240 with 81 degrees of freedom and a significant value is .000 which is less than .050. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude the significance relationship between salary, motivational schemes and current job.
- **Chance in decision making:** The T-TEST has t value of 27.228 with 81 degrees of freedom and a significant value is .000 which is less than .050. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between chance in decision making and salary, motivational schemes and current job.
- **Motivational Schemes:** The t-TEST has t value of 27.288 with 81 degrees of freedom and a significant value is .000 which is less than .050. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between motivational Schemes and salary chance in decision making and current job.
- **Current Job:** The t-TEST has t value of 26.298 with 81 degrees of freedom and a significant value is .000 which is less than .050. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between current job and salary, motivational schemes.

### 4. Relationship Between Salary and Experience

H0: No significant relationship between Salary and Experience

H1: significant relationship between Salary and Experience.

**Table 4. Salary and Experience**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Below 1 year	9	2.11	.928	.309
1 - 3 years	18	2.33	.970	.229
3 - 5 years	7	3.71	.756	.286
5 - 10 years	20	3.70	.801	.179
Above 10 years	28	4.00	.000	.000
Total	82	3.33	1.031	.114

**Table 5. Test of Homogeneity of Variances Salary**

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
8.637	4	77	.000

**Table 5. ANOVA Salary**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	47.592	4	11.898	23.785	.000
Within Groups	38.517	77	.500		
Total	86.110	81			

**Table 6. Tukey HSD**

Experience	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Below 1 year	9	2.11	
1 - 3 years	18	2.33	
5 - 10 years	20		3.70
3 - 5 years	7		3.71
Above 10 years	28		4.00
Sig.		.933	.823

**Table 7. Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	52.588 <sup>a</sup>	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	60.924	12	.000

Linear-by-Linear Association	40.658	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	82		

**Table 8. Symmetric Measures**

		Value	Asymp. Std. Error <sup>a</sup>	Approx. T <sup>b</sup>	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	.801			.000
	Cramer's V	.462			.000
	Contingency Coefficient	.625			.000
Interval by Interval	Pearson's R	.708	.062	8.979	.000 <sup>c</sup>
Ordinal by Ordinal	Spearman Correlation	.714	.052	9.110	.000 <sup>c</sup>
N of Valid Cases		82			

a. Not assuming the null hypothesis.

b. Using the asymptotic standard error assuming the null hypothesis.

c. Based on normal approximation.

**Table 8. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		Salary	Experience
N		82	82
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	3.33	3.49
	Std. Deviation	1.031	1.434
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.413	.225
	Positive	.258	.180
	Negative	-.413	-.225
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		3.740	2.037
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

### Interpretation Results

- ANOVA TEST- The ANOVA has an F Value of 23.785 and the significant value is .000, which is less than 0.05 and so is significant. Hence, we reject null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between salary and experience.
- CHI SQUARE TEST – The chi square value is 52.588 and the significant value is .000, which is less than 0.05 and so is significant. Hence, we reject null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between salary and experience.

## 5. Findings of the Study

- The KMO values indicate that we have highly appreciated and Bartlett's test of sphericity with an associated p value of <0.001 also indicates that we can proceed.
- Only the first two have eigenvalues over 1.00, and together these explain over 96% of the total variability in the data. This leads us to the conclusion that a two factor solution will probably be adequate.
- The four rotated factors are welfare facilities, fringe benefits, safety measures and compensation.
- The factors influencing QWL has very low similarity with each other in assigning the ranks.
- There is a significant relationship between motivational Schemes and salary chance in decision-making and current job.
- There is a significant relationship between current job and salary, chance in decision making, and motivational schemes.

## 6. Suggestions & Recommendations

- Welfare measures can be extent to all the employees of the organization.
- A special awareness to be created about water preservation, water bound diseases and the importance of pure drinking water should be inculcated.
- Transport facilities must be improved.
- Promotional strategies can be improved by financial incentives to motivate the employees.
- Above all worker's participation in management should be allowed and encouraged for the well-being of the organization.

## 7. Conclusion

The concept of Quality of Work Life (QWL) is gaining attention due to its impact on both individuals and organizational effectiveness. It emphasizes participation in problem-solving and decision-making processes within organizations, while also addressing work-life balance concerns. This balance is crucial for mental health, creativity, and productivity. Ultimately, QWL aims to improve the overall work environment, integrating human, technological, and organizational aspects. However, exactly how to achieve this and what constitutes a "better" quality of work life remains uncertain. Through research focusing on various factors, such as work-life balance, attitudes towards the organization can be better understood. This understanding can guide organizations in enhancing their employees' quality of work life.

## References

1. RuchiTrehan, Justin Paul, Determinants of attitude of teachers – factor analysis and strategies for success Competitiveness Review Volume: 24 Issue: 1 2014.
2. Seema Arif, Maryam Ilyas, (2013) "Quality of work-life model for teachers of private universities in Pakistan", Quality Assurance in Education, Vol. 21 Iss: 3, pp.282 – 298.
3. Cynthia Forson- International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research Volume:19 Issue: 5 2013.
4. Annie Stevenson- Quality in Ageing and Older Adults Volume: 14 Issue: 4 2013.

5. Christine A. Grant, Louise M. Wallace, Peter C. Spurgeon, Source: Employee Relations Volume: 35 Issue: 5 2013.
6. Md. Abu Taher- European Journal of Training and Development Volume: 37 Issue: 6 2013.
7. Dev Raj Adhikari, Katsuhiko Hirasawa, Yutaka Takakubo, Dhruva Lal Pandey, Decent work and work life quality in Nepal: an observation Employee Relations Volume: Issue: 1 2012.
8. David Cegarra-Leiva, M. Eugenia Sánchez-Vidal, Juan Gabriel Cegarra-Navarro-Personnel Review Volume: 41 Issue: 3 2012.
9. Sandra IdrovoCarlier, Consuelo Leon Llorente, Marc GrauGrau-European Journal of Training and Development Volume: 36 Issue: 2/3 2012.
10. Aaron David Waller, Gillian Ragsdell- Aslib Proceedings Volume: 64 Issue: 2 2012.
11. Yong Han, Hongdan Zhao- Human Resource Management International Digest Volume: 20 Issue: 1 2012.
12. Jessica Li, Roland K. Yeo- Employee Relations Volume: 33 Issue: 3 2011.
13. RupashreeBaral, Shivganesh Bhargava- Journal of Indian Business Research Volume: 3 Issue: 4 2011.
14. Roland K. Yeo, Jessica Li- Human Resource Management International Digest Volume: 19 Issue: 3 2011.
15. Lisa Bradley, Kerry Brown, Helen Lingard, Keith Townsend, Caroline Baile- International Journal of Managing Projects in Business Volume: 3 Issue: 4 2010.
16. Dev Raj Adhikari, Dhruva Kumar Gautam- International Journal of Law and Management Volume: 52 Issue: 1 2010.